| 6 | n 1 | n | \sim | \sim | \sim |
|----|-----|---|--------|--------|--------|
| 6/ | 21 | _ | U | U | ਬ |

| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: | Version # | APP # 700121 |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------|
| FOR OFFICE USE UNLY: | V 01 01011 11 | |

A. Statement of Activity or Product

The Rand Mountain Management Area (RMMA) has been a popular area for recreation since the 1960's. After the listing of the desert tortoise, the BLM developed the Rand Mountains-Fremont Valley Management Plan to evaluate the complex issues of the area and implement plausible solutions. With the Rand Mountains being classified as Category 1 desert tortoise habitat, the West Mojave Plan (January 2005) stipulated that "those desiring to use vehicles in the Rand Mountains would be required to obtain permits prior to entering the management area...to obtain a use permit, visitors must complete a short educational orientation program and could then purchase a permit". The educational program will include information on the RMMA designated route network and recreational opportunities, restoration areas and habitat values, and vehicle use safety. The goal of this program is to increase compliance with the rules and regulations pertaining to this sensitive management area. Given the goal of increasing compliance, the content of the educational program would focus on staying on the trail.

On November 1st, 2008 the BLM Ridgecrest Field Office implemented Phase 1 of the Rand Mountains Management Area Education and Permit Program. The primary focus of this phase is on outreach and education, so currently the permits are free of charge. For the last five months, the BLM with help from the Student Conservation Association, Friends of Jawbone, and the California City Police has amassed on Holiday weekends to conduct permit outreach in the Rand Mountains area. Users are introduced to the new permit system, given a short narrative on the purpose and requirements and finally given their own permit to fill out if they wish. Phase II is supposed to take effect October, 2009 and requires all vehicle users in the RMMA to complete a short education program and purchase a permit.

B. Relation of Proposed Project to OHV Recreation

Without this educational permit program, the Rand Mountains Management Area (RMMA) could be closed to off highway vehicle use as designated by the West Mojave Plan Amendment because of its habitat status. The hope is that with this education program, the number of users that stay on the designated routes will increase, therefore reducing tortoise and habitat related damage. The permit, which is required to be on their person when inside of the RMMA, includes a user map of the area which is easy to follow with color coded routes to show level of difficulty/vehicle type. Part of this project area has been closed to OHVs since 2002. With the implementation of Phase I of the permit program, two corridors were reopened in this closed area, with the ultimate goal, being to re-open the rest of the routes. This is contingent on the success of the program, of course.

C. Identification of Needs

While this project is still being evaluated for what might work the best, there have been some main components agreed upon. We will allow users to review the educational material online via a computer or using a printed course booklet. Both options would utilize the same course content. All options would incorporate a brief, multiple choice quiz to further instill the key message of the educational program. Visitors who successfully complete the quiz can then purchase a permit. The permits will come with an armband, so that the permit can be visible to passing law enforcement and easily accessible to the user. The permit also includes a map with a list of designated routes, and a summary of key rules and regulations.

The major needs of the project lie with the implementation of Phase II which is supposed to take effect October, 2009. Because we hope to allow users to review the educational material online, internet access and a computer is needed in all of the BLM provided locations. We would also need the capability to create a website specifically for this permit program. The specific needs of this project vary from staff expenditure to the cost of web site design and internet access.

D. Location of Training Services

Locations include Jawbone Station and the Ridgecrest Field Office. Other possible locations could come to fruition in the future.

E. OHV Safety, Environmental Responsibility, and Respect Private Property

Version # Page: 1 of 11

Application: Education & Safety

There will be required course study material which incorporates all of the above components and a quiz with questions directly relating to each of these components.

By emphasizing staying on the trail, the education program can address safety (i.e. dangerous mine shafts, arsenic remediation), sensitive restoration areas, habitat values (i.e. tortoise), and recreational opportunities (including the issues of the tri-city communities of Randsburg, Red Mountain and Johannesburg). The permit itself has information on the back of it such as: what to do in an emergency, mine safety, the designated route network, threats to the Desert Tortoise and other species of concern, and the RMMA rules and regulations.

Additional Documentation for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009 6/2/2009 Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office Application: Education & Safety

| | FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: | Version # | APP # 700121 |
|---|--|-----------|--|
| 1 | Optional Project-Specific Application I Attachments: | Documents | Rand Mountains Management Area Permit EA |
| 2 | Optional Project-specific Maps Attachments: | | Rand Mountain Mangt. Area Map |

Version # Page: 3 of 11

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009 Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office Application: Education & Safety

| | | FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: | Version # | | | APP # | | |
|-------|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| APPL | ICANT NAME : | BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office | | | | | | |
| PROJ | ECT TITLE : | Education & Safety | | | | PROJECT NUME (Division use on | | |
| DPO I | ECT TYPE : | Acquisition | ☐ Development | | ☑ Edu | cation & Safety | Ground Ope | erations |
| FROS | LOT TIFE. | Law Enforcement | Planning | | Restoration | | | |
| PROJ | ECT DESCRIPTION : | The Rand Mountain Management Area developed the Rand Mountains-Fremo Rand Mountains being classified as Ca in the Rand Mountains would be requireducational orientation program and conetwork and recreational opportunities with the rules and regulations pertaining program would focus on staying on the On November 1st, 2008 the BLM Ridg The primary focus of this phase is on the Student Conservation Association, the Rand Mountains area. Users are if own permit to fill out if they wish. Phase education program and purchase a permit to support the student of th | ont Valley Managementegory 1 desert tor- red to obtain permit- could then purchase and to this sensitive netrail. The extrail of the course of | nent Plan to evaluatoise habitat, the V s prior to entering a permit". The ed and habitat values nanagement area. Implemented Phastion, so currently the, and the Californ we permit system, of the state of the control | te the comp Vest Mojave the manage ucational properties, and vehicle Given the control of the permits and City Policing given a short | plex issues of the area as a Plan (January 2005) sement areato obtain a rogram will include informe use safety. The goal goal of increasing compared free of charge. For the has amassed on Holith narrative on the purpose | and implement plausible tipulated that "those deuse permit, visitors mumation on the RMMA dof this program is to incliance, the content of the ement Area Education at the last five months, the day weekends to conduse and requirements a | e solutions. With the siring to use vehicles ast complete a short esignated route crease compliance e educational and Permit Program. EBLM with help from uct permit outreach in and finally given their |
| | Line Item | | Qty | Rate | UOM | Grant Request | Match | Total |
| DIREC | CT EXPENSES | | | | | | | |
| Progr | am Expenses | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Staff | | | | | | | |
| | Other-Administrative | Staff | 80.000 | 25.000 | HRS | 0.00 | 2,000.00 | 2,000.00 |
| | Park Ranger | | 200.000 | 20.000 | HRS | 0.00 | 4,000.00 | 4,000.00 |
| | Other-Law Enforcement | ent Ranger | 400.000 | 38.000 | HRS | 0.00 | 15,200.00 | 15,200.00 |
| | Other-Outdoor Recre | ation Planner | 500.000 | 30.000 | HRS | 5,000.00 | 10,000.00 | 15,000.00 |
| | Other-Recreation Bra | nch Chief | 160.000 | 45.000 | HRS | 0.00 | 7,200.00 | 7,200.00 |
| | Other-Field Office Ma | nager | 80.000 | 65.000 | HRS | 0.00 | 5,200.00 | 5,200.00 |
| | Other-Volunteers (SC | CA, etc) | 150.000 | 18.000 | HRS | 0.00 | 2,700.00 | 2,700.00 |

Version #

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009 Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office Application: Education & Safety

| Line Item | Qty | Rate | UOM | Grant Request | Match | Total |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Total for Staff | | | | 5,000.00 | 46,300.00 | 51,300.00 |
| 2 Contracts | | | | | | |
| 3 Materials / Supplies | | | | | | |
| Other-Educational Booklets | 5000.000 | 3.000 | EA | 15,000.00 | 0.00 | 15,000.00 |
| Other-Permits | 10000.00 | 2.000 | EA | 20,000.00 | 0.00 | 20,000.00 |
| Other-map printing | 10000.00 | 3.000 | EA | 30,000.00 | 0.00 | 30,000.00 |
| Other-Armbands | 10000.00 | 4.000 | EA | 40,000.00 | 0.00 | 40,000.00 |
| Total for Materials / Supplies | | | | 105,000.00 | 0.00 | 105,000.00 |
| 4 Equipment Use Expenses | | | | | | |
| 5 Equipment Purchases | Equipment Purchases | | | | | |
| Other-Computer with Printer | 1.000 | 1000.000 | EA | 1,000.00 | 0.00 | 1,000.00 |
| 6 Others | | | | | | |
| Other-Web Site programming | 15000.00 | 1.000 | MISC | 15,000.00 | 0.00 | 15,000.00 |
| 7 Administrative Costs | Administrative Costs | | | | | |
| Administrative Costs-10 Percent | 1.000 | 12600.000 | YR | 0.00 | 12,600.00 | 12,600.00 |
| Total Program Expenses | | | | 126,000.00 | 58,900.00 | 184,900.00 |
| TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES | | | | 126,000.00 | 58,900.00 | 184,900.00 |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES | | | | 126,000.00 | 58,900.00 | 184,900.00 |

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009 Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office Application: Education & Safety

| | Line Item | Grant Request | Match | Total | Narrative | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| DIRE | DIRECT EXPENSES | | | | | | | |
| Prog | ram Expenses | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Staff | 5,000.00 | 46,300.00 | 51,300.00 | | | | |
| 2 | Contracts | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | |
| 3 | Materials / Supplies | 105,000.00 | 0.00 | 105,000.00 | | | | |
| 4 | Equipment Use Expenses | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | |
| 5 | Equipment Purchases | 1,000.00 | 0.00 | 1,000.00 | | | | |
| 6 | Others | 15,000.00 | 0.00 | 15,000.00 | | | | |
| 7 | Administrative Costs | 0.00 | 12,600.00 | 12,600.00 | | | | |
| Total | Program Expenses | 126,000.00 | 58,900.00 | 184,900.00 | | | | |
| TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES | | 126,000.00 | 58,900.00 | 184,900.00 | | | | |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES | | 126,000.00 | 58,900.00 | 184,900.00 | | | | |

Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS) for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009
Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office
Application: Education & Safety

| | FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # APP # 700121 |
|----|---|
| | TEM 1 and ITEM 2 |
| • | ITEM 1 |
| a. | ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? Yes No (Please select Yes or No) |
| | ITEM 2 |
| b. | ITEM 2 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? Yes (Please select Yes or No) |
| C. | The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws Yes and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) |
| d. | Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS $3-9$ |
| | The project is to educate the public solely through use of paper and computerized information, not through any "ground breaking" activities. |
| ı | TEM 3 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands |
| | |
| ı | TEM 4 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project |
| ı | TEM 5 - Soil Impacts |
| I | TEM 6 - Damage to Scenic Resources |
| ı | TEM 7 - Hazardous Materials |
| | Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Yes No Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) |
| | If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards. |
| ı | TEM 8 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources |
| | Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to Yes No historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) |
| | If YES, describe the potential impacts and for any substantially adverse changes in the significance of historical or cultural resources and measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the impacts. |
| ı | TEM 9 - Indirect Significant Impacts |
| (| CEQA/NEPA Attachment |

Version # Page: 7 of 11

6/2/2009

| | | FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: | Version # | APP # 700121 |
|----|----|--|------------------------|---|
| 1. | | Evaluation Criteria - Q 1. | | |
| ١. | | | ng type of Project: (C | Check the one most appropriate.) (Please select one |
| | | Education – Applicants shall only responsible Safety – Applicants shall only responsible | - | |
| | 1. | As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate Applicant is 3 | ate, the percentage | of the cost of the Project covered by the |
| | | (Check the one most appropriate) (Plea | use select one from | ist) |
| | | 76% or more (10 points) | 1 | 51% - 75% (5 points) |
| | | © 26% - 50% (3 points) | | 25% (Match minimum) (No points) |
| 2. | | Evaluation Criteria - Q 2. | | |
| | 2. | For Applicant's OHV Grant Projects whithe last two years, the percentage of all | | of the Project performance period within plished 3 |
| | | (Check the one most appropriate) (Plea | se select one from | ist) |
| | | 100% of Deliverable accomplished | | |
| | | 75% to 99% of Deliverables accom | | |
| | | Less than 75% of Deliverables acc | | · |
| | | First time Applicants and past Appl | licants with no active | e Grant projects within the last two years (2 points) |
| 3. | | Evaluation Criteria - Q 3. (FOR DIVISIO | N USE ONLY) | |
| | 3. | Previous Year Performance 3 | | |
| | | (FOR DIVISION USE ONLY) (Check the | one most appropri | ate) (Please select one from list) |
| | | In the previous year the Applicant I OHMVR Grant Administrator by ph | | e and communicated effectively with the assigned nal visit (3 points) |
| | | First time Applicants and past Appl | licants with no active | e Grant projects within the last two years (2 points) |
| | | In the previous year the Applicant h | has not been respor | nsive (No points) |
| 4. | | Evaluation Criteria - Q 4. | | |
| | 4. | The Project will utilize partnerships to su organizations that will participate in the | - | ish the Project. The number of partner |
| | | (Check the one most appropriate.) (Plea | ase select one from | list) |
| | | 4 or more (4 points) | | 2 to 3 (2 points) |
| | | C 1 (1 point) | , | None (No points) |
| | | List partner organization(s) | | |
| | | Friends of Jawbone | | |
| | | California City Police Department | | |
| | | Kern County Board of Supervisors, Distributed Desert Advisory Council | rict 1 and 2 | |
| | | Kern County Sheriff | | |
| | | · | | |

Evaluation Criteria - Q 5.

5. The Project addresses the following types of OHV Recreation $\,\,\,$ 5

Page: 8 of 11 Version #

6/2/2009

Evaluation Criteria for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009 Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office Application: Education & Safety

| | ☑ ATV | ▼ 4X4 |
|----|--|--|
| | ✓ M.C.☐ Snowmobile☐ Other (Specify) | Recreation Utility Vehicle (RUV) Dune buggy, rail |
| | Evaluation Criteria - Q 6. | |
| 6. | | e following 2 |
| | (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maxim | um of 2 points (Please select applicable values) |
| | Explain each statement that was checked | |
| | related to the Rand Mountain Management Area. The teat Desert District Advisory Council, and BLM management. recreation and environmental communities also provided in | m includes Kern County Supervisors, members of the Members of stakeholder groups representing the nsight and advice to the team. The project is also |
| ı | Evaluation Criteria - Q 7. (Education Project ONLY) | |
| 7. | The Project incorporates the following, clearly identifiable | and/or measurable, elements 10 |
| | Objectives (2 points) | |
| ı | Evaluation Criteria - Q 8. (Education Project ONLY) | |
| 8. | Total number of points of contact the Project is anticipated | to reach 4 |
| | (Check the one most appropriate.) (Please select one from Greater than 10,000 (4 points) 100 to 1,000 (2 points) 0 to 20 (No points) | n list) C 1,000 to 10,000 (3 points) C 20 to 100 (1 point) |
| I | Evaluation Criteria - Q 9. (Education Project ONLY) | |
| 9. | Total time a participant will have exposure to the Project's | message or training 3 |
| | Greater than 2 hours (4 points) 1 hour to 2 hours (3 points) 5 minutes to less than 1 hour (2 points) 1 minute to less than 5 minutes (A Project for maps v | |
| | 8. | W.C. Snowmobile Other (Specify) Evaluation Criteria - Q 6. 6. The Project was developed with public input employing the (Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maxim Weeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point) Weeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point) Explain each statement that was checked A Technical Review Team was formed to provide public in related to the Rand Mountain Management Area. The teat Desert District Advisory Council, and BLM management. I recreation and environmental communities also provided it discussed regularly at the Ridgecrest Steering Committee members of the public are invited to attend. Evaluation Criteria - Q 7. (Education Project ONLY) 7. The Project incorporates the following, clearly identifiable of the Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values) Wercess of researching issues and audience (2 points) Process of researching issues and audience (2 points) Fevaluation and feedback of the process (2 points) Evaluation Criteria - Q 8. (Education Project ONLY) 8. Total number of points of contact the Project is anticipated (Check the one most appropriate.) (Please select one from Greater than 10,000 (4 points) O to 20 (No points) Evaluation Criteria - Q 9. (Education Project ONLY) 9. Total time a participant will have exposure to the Project's (Check the one item of highest point value that applies.) (Foreater than 2 hours (4 points) 1 hour to 2 hours (3 points) |

10. Evaluation Criteria - Q 10. (Education Project ONLY)

Page: 9 of 11 Version #

6/2/2009

Evaluation Criteria for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2008/2009 Agency: BLM - Ridgecrest Field Office Application: Education & Safety

| 10. The Project will utilize the following methods of education | n 14 |
|---|---|
| (Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 point each up to a maxi | mum of 14 points (Please select applicable values) |
| | Tool kits |
| | |
| ✓ Internet messaging/CDs | Signage |
| Advertising | ☐ Radio/TV |
| Community involvement | Other (Specify) [online education course] |
| ☐ Public relations/media | |
| 11. Evaluation Criteria - Q 11. (Education Project ONLY) | |
| The Project provides direct support for delivery of ATV S Foundation training 0 | Safety Institute and/or Motorcycle Safety |
| (Check the one most appropriate.) (Please select one fr | om list) |
| No (No points) | C Yes (2 points) |
| | |
| 12. Evaluation Criteria - Q 12. & 13. (Safety Project ONLY |) |
| 12. The Project will utilize personnel trained to the following | level |
| (Check the one most appropriate.) (Please select one fr | om list) |
| Emergency Medical Technician level, or higher (5 points) | First Responder level (2 points) |
| First Aid and CPR (1 points) | No training (No points) |
| 13. The Project will provide search and rescue as follows | |
| (Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from | om list) |
| 24 hours, 7 days per week (5 points) | C Less than 24 hours, 7 days per week (4 points) |
| C Less than 24 hours, less than 7 days per week (2 points) | C On special occasions/events only (No points) |
| 13. Evaluation Criteria - Q 14. (Safety Project ONLY) | |
| 14. The Project will have the majority of personnel trained in | the following areas |
| (Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each up to a max | ximum of 16 points (Please select applicable values) |
| Radio communication | ☐ Tracking skills |
| Avalanche rescue | ☐ Navigation training |
| Swift water rescue | ATV certification |
| Dog handling | Motorcycle certification |
| Rope skills | 4 x 4/Off-Road training |
| ☐ Wilderness search and rescue | ☐ Other (Specify) |
| 14. Evaluation Criteria - Q 15. (Safety Project ONLY) | |
| | |
| 15. The Project will have resources that are equipped and to conditions* | rained for rescue in the following environmental |
| (Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values) | |
| □ Type 1 – Extreme Condition (including but not limit Desert, Heat, Heavy ground cover, Steep difficult to | |
| Type 2 – Rugged Terrain. Rugged conditions, Altif Moderate to heavy ground cover. (2 points) | ude (generally under 7000 feet), Heat, Cold concerns, |

Page: 10 of 11 Version #

□ Type 3 – Moderate/Gentle Terrain. Gently rolling terrain, Open spaces, Maintained trailheads, and Agricultural areas. (2 points)
 □ Type 4 – Urban. High traffic, Urban office complexes, man-made surfaces, Public interaction and Park trails. (2 points)

* From the Governor's Office of Emergency Services – Mutual Aid Guidelines, Search and Rescue, Off-Highway Vehicles

Version # Page: 11 of 11